

Natache D. Rinegard-Guirma
5731 NE 10th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97211
503.278.0709

FILED '10 SEP 28 12:09 JUS/DC

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

PORTLAND DIVISION

Natache D. Rinegard-Guirma

Plaintiff,

Civil Case No: 10-1065-PK

vs.

**MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO FILE SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Bank of America, National Association as successor by merger to LaSalle Bank National Association, as trustee under the Pooling And Servicing Agreement dated as of August 1st, 2006, GSAMP Trust 2006-HE5, MERS, Litton Loan Servicing LP, and the original and purported successor trustees, LSI Title Company of Oregon, LLC, and Quality Loan Servicing Corporation of Washington.

Defendants.

This court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S. C. 1331.

For the reasons set forth herein, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court grant her leave to file the Second Amended Complaint because it will clarify and allow Plaintiff to describe in further detail as accurately as possible, given the Plaintiff's insufficiencies, relief requested, support for assertions made in Complaint filed September 8th, 2010 and set forth additional facts that, when taken as truth, will identify the connection between Defendants unlawful actions and damages suffered by Plaintiff.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

I. Grounds for Granting Leave to Amend

According to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15, a party may amend the party's pleading once as a matter of course at any time before responsive pleading is served...otherwise a party may amend the party's pleading **only** by leave of court or written consent of the adverse party. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). Where leave of the court is sought, Rule 15 states, leave shall be freely given when justice so requires....In the absence of any apparent or declared reason, such as undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the movant, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendments previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of allowance of the amendment, futility of amendment, etc.,...the leave sought should, as the rule requires, be 'freely given'.

II. The Motion for Leave is Filed in Good Faith

Changes in the proposed Second Amended Complaint do not alter the underlying claims set forth in the prior Complaints. Amendment maintains the allegations of the original complaint, do not include facts that are not already known to the Defendants and, Defendants will have full and adequate opportunity to defend against these claims.

Plaintiff's request does not reflect any "dilatory motive" on the Plaintiff's part, nor would allowing Plaintiff's Motion For Leave To File A Second Amended Complaint impose any undue prejudice upon the Defendants. There has been no undue delay by the Plaintiff in amending the complaint.

Plaintiff hereby moves this Court for leave to file the attached Second Amended Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, Rule 15.

Dated: 9.27.10

